

EXTRA--- Four "Blue Sunday" Bills Before Congress

LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

DEVOTED TO THE AMERICAN
EXEMPLIFIED IN THE
✱ ✱ OF CHURCH

IDEA OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY
COMPLETE SEPARATION
AND STATE

AMERICANS, AWAKE! YOUR CONSTITUTIONAL LIBERTIES ENDANGERED!

FOUR "blue Sunday" bills of Puritan intolerance have been introduced into Congress at the instigation of a powerful "religious lobby" at Washington, which seeks to intimidate the Legislature, place civil fetters upon the conscience of free Americans, and secure a strangle hold on the inalienable rights of citizens. A terrific battle has been raging before Congressional committees between the professional reformers and the champions of religious freedom, and it is high time for the friends of Constitutional liberties to arise and administer a fitting rebuke to these forces which are now determined to erect in our land a religio-civil despotism.

This Magazine is published quarterly at 35 cents a year. This Extra is 5 cents per single copy; \$2 per hundred; \$16 per thousand.

Printed in the U. S. A.

Explanatory Note

THIS LIBERTY EXTRA deals with four compulsory Sunday observance bills introduced into the Sixty-ninth Congress, and which are now pending before the House Committee for the District of Columbia.

These "blue Sunday" bills now pending are known as H. R. 7179, H. R. 7822, H. R. 10123, and H. R. 10311. All these religious measures are ostensibly for the District of Columbia, but as their sponsors have repeatedly asserted their ultimate design is to serve as a model and national legal precedent for a Sunday observance law for the whole nation, under the guise of the exercise of the police power of the Federal Government.

Representative Lankford, of Georgia, introduced the first of these drastic Sunday bills, at the instigation of the Lord's Day Alliance of America, which claims it to be their own bill which they framed and requested to be introduced. After six hearings on this bill before the committee, it received such a drubbing from its opponents that Representative Lankford concluded it could not pass, so he introduced H. R. 10311, in the hope of overcoming most of the objections; but his last bill received even greater bombardment at the seventh hearing before the committee, and is more objectionable to the opponents.

Representative Edwards, of Georgia, introduced H. R. 10123, prohibiting on Sundays innocent amusements, legitimate recreation, movies, theaters, and all secular gatherings and entertainments where an admission fee is charged.

This bill aims to protect nobody, but a day, and was introduced at the request of the religious "reformers" who feel that heaven has intrusted them with the responsibility of acting as the sponsors for the morals and religion of Americans.

Representative Keller, of Minnesota, introduced another Sunday measure, H. R. 7822, closing only barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday, which is purely a piece of class legislation.

Seven hearings have already been held before the judiciary subcommittee of the House District Committee, and other hearings are scheduled for the future. More than twenty moral reform and religious organizations sent their leading representatives to speak in favor of these religious measures. They cajoled, they argued, they threatened, they sought to intimidate Congressmen. They vilified and impugned the motives of their opponents in language so abusive, insulting, and acrimonious that some of it was stricken from the record.

In view of the imminent danger which threatens the Constitutional liberties of the American people, prompt action is needed to defeat this mischievous religious legislation; and since the regular issue of the LIBERTY magazine for the third quarter of 1926 does not come from the press till the middle of June, we are issuing this Extra, hoping that it will reach many millions in its nation-wide circulation, and cause them to send in petitions of protest against these pernicious bills.

If any of these Sunday observance bills should be enacted into law by Congress, such action would establish a most dangerous precedent, and a flood of still more drastic religious measures of a similar character would quickly follow.

This Extra is filled with valuable information, besides a full reproduction of the Sunday bills, and shows how ecclesiastical diplomats and church reform organizations are seeking to enforce religious tenets by law under the penal codes, thus uniting church and state in America.

Just now, while this is a burning issue before Congress, you are urged to secure all the signatures possible to the petition on the last page of this Extra. Cut it off and paste extra sheets of paper on the bottom to accommodate more signatures, and send to your Representative in Congress.

The price of this Extra is 5 cents a single copy, \$2 a hundred, or \$16 a thousand. Let every lover of liberty enter this campaign in defense of our God-given liberties.

Address all orders to LIBERTY MAGAZINE, Washington, D. C.

C. S. LONGACRE.

LIBERTY A Magazine of Religious Freedom

Editor, Charles S. Longacre; Associate, William F. Martin. Managing Editor, Calvin F. Bollman.

Entered as second-class matter, May 1, 1906, at the post office in Washington, D. C., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879; acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of Oct. 3, 1917, authorized on June 22, 1918.

Subscription Rates.—Single copy, one year, 35 cents; three years (or three subscriptions 1 year) \$1.00; five or more copies, mailed by publishers to one address or to five addresses, postpaid, each 9 cents. No subscriptions for less than one year received.

The price of this Extra is 5 cents a single copy, \$2 a hundred, or \$16 a thousand. Five to twenty-five copies mailed by publishers to one address or to separate addresses, postpaid, each 6 cents.

Send all orders to LIBERTY MAGAZINE, Washington, D. C.

LIBERTY

A MAGAZINE OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Published quarterly by the
REVIEW AND HERALD PUBLISHING ASSN., TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

VOL. XXI

SECOND QUARTER, 1926, EXTRA

NO. 3

Congress Invaded by Gigantic Religious Lobby

Four "Blue Sunday" Bills Pending Before Congress

By the Editor, C. S. Longacre

THE most notable contest between the forces that are working for religious bondage and those championing the cause of religious freedom, has been waging over four drastic compulsory Sunday observance bills now before Congress.

On March 4 the opening guns were fired in this great religious controversy, when representatives of more than twenty different religious and reform organizations lined up before the District judiciary subcommittee of the House in an endeavor to force a favorable report on their Sunday bills. It was the most formidable array of religious leaders and the longest and most severely contested fight ever staged before a Congressional committee on a religious issue. The battle has just begun, and undoubtedly will continue to rage through this and the next session of Congress, before this burning question is finally disposed of.

For nearly one hundred and fifty years repeated attempts have been made by various religious organizations to induce Congress to enact compulsory Sunday observance bills and other religious measures, but so far our national lawmakers have consistently and persistently refused on Constitutional grounds to yield to this demand. There is not a single Sunday law on the Federal statute books today for the territory over which the national Government holds jurisdiction. The fact that our Federal Government is completely divorced from religious establishments has been a great aggravation to the "religious and professional reformers" at Washington, and this proposed Puritan Sunday legislation is the wedding ring to unite church and state in unholy wedlock in America.

The enactment into law of a religious custom followed in common by the leading denominations is a part of the program to nationalize

UNITED STATES SENATE, JAN. 19, 1829: "What other nations call religious toleration, we call religious rights. They are not exercised in virtue of governmental indulgence, but as rights, of which government cannot deprive any portion of citizens, however small. Despotic power may invade those rights, but justice still confirms them."

GEORGE BANCROFT: "The American Constitution, in harmony with the people of the several States, withheld from the Federal Government the power to invade the home of reason, the citadel of conscience, the sanctuary of the soul; and not from indifference, but that the infinite Spirit of eternal truth might move in its freedom and purity and power."

and establish the Christian religion by law. The District of Columbia Sunday law, it is said, is to become a model law for the whole nation. The effect of such legislation would be to require all men to have practically one religion, defined and enforced by the Federal Government. Differences of opinion, if reduced to practice, would be suppressed by law. This, in effect, is the program of "the religious lobby" at Washington, which has already appeared in seven hearings on their inquisitorial Sunday bills.

The first general Sunday bill introduced was framed by the leaders of the Lord's Day Alliance of America, and is known as the Lankford Bill H. R. 7179. (For text of this bill, see back cover page.)

"A Strictly Religious Measure"

Only those who have a sinister purpose to serve and a selfish object to accomplish will call this a civil measure. It is tintured all through with religion, and religion with an indigo hue. At the hearings, the representatives of every organization that would be oppressed by this bill, if it became a law, called it both religious and class legislation; and the representatives of every religious organization that was to be favored by the enactment of this bill, called it civil legislation.

If Sunday is a civil or secular institution, as the Lord's Day Alliance speakers assert, then certainly civil and secular things ought to be lawful and permitted on Sunday, instead of prohibited. The fact that the bill prohibits "civil and secular" affairs, and allows only religious acts for "religious uses" on Sunday, is unmistakable evidence that the purpose of the bill is to promote religion by law.

Section 2 says, "It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to labor . . . on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday." That the phrase "Lord's day" is a religious expression, applicable only to a religious institution; and that what the bill aims to prohibit is honorable "labor" and "secular business" on the Lord's day, shows conclusively that this measure is purely religious in character, and not civil. An act that is civil on Monday is also civil on Sunday. An act that is moral on Monday is also moral on Sunday. When an

act moral in itself is prohibited by law on only one day in the week, it is clear that the purpose of the law is to honor the day. Religion forbids on the Sabbath day what morality allows on seven days of each week. To whom does "the Lord's day" belong? It belongs to the Lord, and not to Caesar. It bears the Lord's superscription, and therefore the duty of Sabbath observance belongs to the Lord, and should not be rendered to Caesar, or the state. We must render to God the things that are God's, and to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. (See Matt. 22: 21.)

The fourth section of this bill says:

"It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia to keep open or use . . . any place of public assembly at which an admission fee is directly or indirectly received, or to engage in commercialized sports or amusements on the Lord's day, commonly called Sunday."

No travelogue, musical concert, popular lecture, or entertainment of any kind where a "fee is directly or indirectly received," is permissible on Sunday. Is this a civil prohibition? Are such things uncivil? No sane person will so affirm. Religion alone forbids such things on the Sabbath day, and yet some say this is not a religious law.

Sports and amusements are allowable under this act, provided they are not "commercialized" on Sunday. What wonderful reasoning! The "dancing saloon, theater, . . . motion pictures, plays spoken or silent, opera, vaudeville," and all kinds of "sports or amusements," are lawful according to this bill, only so they are not "commercialized" on Sunday. Receiving a "fee" "directly or indirectly" is a crime, not on Monday, but on Sunday.

What makes commercialism or the handling of money a crime on Sunday and not on Monday? Assuredly it cannot be civilly or morally wrong to receive a fee on Sunday, else it would be civilly and morally wrong on Monday and on every other day. Religion alone suggests such a prohibition. But in America religion cannot be made the basis of a civil law; for the First Amendment to the Constitution placed a limitation upon the powers of Congress when our founding fathers said to the highest lawmaking body in America, "Congress shall make no law

JUDGE WELCH, of the supreme court of Ohio: "When Christianity asks the aid of government beyond mere impartial protection, it disowns itself. Its essential interests lie beyond the reach and range of human governments. United with government, religion never rises above the merest superstition; united with religion, government never rises above the merest despotism; and all history shows us that the more widely and completely they are separated, the better it is for both."—23 Ohio Reports, Granger, pp. 249, 250.

GEORGE WASHINGTON: "Every man who conducts himself as a good citizen, is accountable alone to God for his religious faith, and should be protected in worshipping God according to the dictates of his own conscience."—Reply to the Baptists of Virginia, 1789.

respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." This Amendment has caused Congress to turn a deaf ear to the religious zealots who have urged upon our lawmakers during the last forty years more than one hundred and fifty compulsory Sunday observance bills, and this Sixty-ninth Congress can perform no nobler deed than to follow the illustrious example of its predecessors by turning a deaf ear to the advocates of these measures.

This Lankford bill received such a terrific bombardment from every quarter during the first six sessions of the hearings before the House District Committee, that Representative Lankford introduced another bill, known as H. R. 10311, as a possible substitute for the first bill. *This second bill is just like the first, except that it adds a few more exceptions to the list of "works of necessity," and a pretended exemption for one who "uniformly keeps another day of the week as holy time."*

This exemption clause reads as follows:

"Sec. 4. It shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for work or labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as holy time and does not labor on that day, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week."

The Exemption Valueless

This exemption is one of the most vicious and tyrannical ever framed by a legislator. It places three most oppressive conditions upon those who observe another day than Sunday:

The first imposition is that they have to appear in court as defendants, and make "a sufficient defense to a prosecution," which means often an outlay of hundreds of dollars in a single case. Not infrequently appeal has to be made to the Supreme Court before justice can be obtained, and even an appeal is precarious. *This has been our experience before the courts in States having similar exemptions. Every seventh-day observer is liable to such a prosecution if he works on Sunday. It is an unjust penalty placed upon his religious faith.*

Second, *he must prove to the satisfaction of the court that he has "uniformly" kept "another day of the week as holy time."* If he has not kept the day "uniformly" and "as holy time," the court will deny him the benefit of the

exemption under this proposed law. The fact that he must keep the day "as holy time" in order to be privileged to work under an alleged civil statute, is clear-cut evidence that this is a religious law instead of a civil law.

If a person uniformly observing Sunday should, upon clear evidence, change his opinion, as a wise man often does, and start to keep the seventh day instead of the first day of the week, the law would deny him the privilege of the exemption, because he could not prove that he had "uniformly" kept another day "as holy time." Again, a man who rests on Saturday but does not keep the day "as holy time," is denied the privilege of this exemption. This is not only a religious law, but a bigoted, intolerant, religious law. The Sunday observer has no more right to say to the man who observes Saturday that he must not work on Sunday under certain conditions, than the man who observes Saturday has a right to say to the man who observes Sunday that he must not work on Saturday under the same conditions. *This proposed law does not conform to the golden rule.*

Third, the man who observes Saturday must, under this law, not only keep the day holy in order to work on Sunday, but the work he is permitted to do on Sunday, after he meets all the other religious tests under this law, must not be "done in such manner as to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week." This places the man who observes the seventh day of the week as holy time in a most precarious and uncertain position if he works on Sunday. Some people who allow religious prejudice and intolerance to dominate their lives, are very easily disturbed in their minds. We know of a case where a seventh-day observer was spied upon by a bigoted, narrow-minded Sunday blue law advocate, while hoeing corn on Sunday four miles from a public highway in Tennessee. *This bigot left his team on the highway, walked across the fields through the woods to observe this man hoeing corn behind a grove of trees, and then walked back, drove to church, and later lodged a complaint and caused the farmer's arrest because he disturbed his peace of mind. He could not enjoy the sermon that day, for thinking of that Sabbatarian hoeing his corn on Sunday.*

Virginia has an exemption for "any man who conscientiously believes that the seventh day of the week ought to be observed as a Sabbath,

THOMAS JEFFERSON: "Almighty God hath created the mind free; all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend only to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness, and are a departure from the plan of the holy Author of our religion, who, being Lord both of body and mind, yet chose not to propagate it by coercion on either, as was in His almighty power to do."—Virginia Act for Establishing Religious Freedom, 1786.

JAMES MADISON: "Religion is not in the purview of human government. Religion is essentially distinct from government and exempt from its cognizance. A connection between them is injurious to both."—Letter to Edward Everett, 1823.

and actually refrains from all secular business and labor on that day," provided he disturbs no Sunday keeper. The commonwealth's attorney, Mr. Wise, May 14, 1919, prosecuted eighty-five Jews and Seventh-day Adventists under this law in Richmond, and the court convicted them. Mr. Wise argued as follows:

"It disturbs the one who observes Sunday when he goes to church and he sees others laboring and merchandising on Sunday. It distracts his peace of mind, so much so that he is unable to concentrate his attention upon the sermon. He may not be bodily disturbed in a physical sense, but he is disturbed mentally. . . . We cannot have our train of thoughts disturbed on Sundays but what this exception is forfeited by those who thus disturb our thoughts."

Again, in Arkansas a similar exemption was granted by the State legislature to those who observed another day than Sunday as holy time. A Seventh-day Adventist by the name of Swearingen went about quietly working in a field on his farm on Sunday, after he had sacredly observed the seventh day of the week, as God had commanded him. He disturbed no one in reality. He interfered with no one's rights. He was an honest, upright, industrious citizen. His jealous neighbors observed him quietly working on Sunday, as the Arkansas Sunday law permitted him to do under the exemption. They reported him to the grand jury; he was indicted and arrested. Twenty days after his indictment, the State legislature was induced to repeal this exemption, which was enacted for his benefit and under which he did his work, and he was afterward tried and convicted and fined. The repealed law was made retroactive by these religious bigots and tyrants. The fine and costs amounted to \$34.20. Having no money to pay the fine, this Christian moral citizen and his son of seventeen were dragged to the county jail, and imprisoned like felons for twenty-five days. The sheriff then sold the old man's only horse, his sole reliance to make bread for his family. The horse brought at public auction only \$26.50. A few days later the sheriff levied on his only cow to pay the rest of the fine and costs, and also for room and board while in jail, amounting to \$21.25. The sheriff would have sold the cow if the Religious Liberty Association, which issues this *LIBERTY* magazine, had not paid the balance due. Do not tell us we are exempt under this inquisitorial law. It is all a farce. Hundreds of sincere Christians have suffered untold hardships in fines, in prisons, and in chain gangs, under Sunday laws far less drastic

than this proposed Puritanical law for the District of Columbia.

In America all citizens are supposed to be equal before the law. What greater right, therefore, has the Sunday observer to say to the man who observes the seventh day of the week, that he must not do any work on Sunday that disturbs him, than has the Sabbatarian to say to the Sunday observer that he likewise must not do any work on Saturday to disturb him? Is the conscience of the first-day observer more sacred than the conscience of the seventh-day observer? Is the Sunday blue law advocate more sensitive on Sunday than the Seventh-day Adventist on Saturday? If both have the same kind of conscience and the same kind of nerves, why give the one protection above the other? How can the state favor one set of religionists above another, and be just and equal to all its citizens?

This exemption proves beyond the shadow of a doubt that this proposed Sunday law is a strictly religious law instead of a civil law, and is therefore unconstitutional. Why are Seventh-day Adventists allowed under this exemption to carry on labor that is not necessary, but purely civil and secular, on Sundays, while the Sunday observer is prohibited? Is it for a civil reason or for a religious reason that this exemption is granted? Most assuredly it is because of their religious faith that they are granted this exemption in theory, which is often denied them in practice. Since religion alone is the basis for granting this exemption, it brands this proposed law as religious in purpose, religious in nature, and religious in its application. Under our Constitution, Congress cannot rightfully pass such a law. It is unjust, discriminatory, partial, sectarian, un-American, anti-Christian, and unconstitutional.

Moreover, this exemption allows only secular labor, but not secular business, like merchandising, on Sunday. Why are Seventh-day Adventists, and others who observe the seventh day, and those who observe no day, denied the right under this exemption to carry on secular business, like merchandising, on Sunday? Why the discrimination? Why the inequality? Religion, and the religion of the Sunday observer, alone is the basis for such a law, hence it is unconstitutional.

Two More Bills Pending

Representative Keller, of Minnesota, introduced a bill known as H. R. 7822, aiming to make giving a shave, a haircut, or a shampoo,

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: "Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage, and you prepare your own limbs to wear them."—From Speech at Edwardsville, Ill., Sept. 13, 1855.

on Sunday a crime provided it is done in a barber shop by a barber. (For full text of this bill, see back cover page.)

Representative Edwards, of Georgia, introduced another compulsory Sunday observance bill, known as H. R. 10123. (For text of this bill, see back cover page.)

Prohibits Innocent Recreation Only

This bill aims to prohibit and close up all "places where secular and commercialized sports and amusements are carried on or staged, for which admissions are charged, in the District of Columbia, on Sunday." The fact that it prohibits secular and permits only religious places to open on Sunday, is positive proof of the religious character and purpose of this bill. The fact that this proposed law applies to only one class of secular business, and exempts all other classes of secular business, shows the law to be unjust, discriminatory class legislation. A law to be just must deal with all classes alike that would naturally fall under the same general application of the law.

We hold no brief for the dance hall, the theater, or the movie. We never patronize such places. But that is no reason why we should favor a law to prevent others from going there, over whose personal conduct we have no jurisdiction. If a theater is unclean and immoral, it ought to be cleaned up on seven days of the week, and not merely prohibited on one day. If it is civilly legitimate, honorable, and moral on Monday, why is it not so on Sunday? The only motive that can possibly be assigned for closing on Sunday a theater or movie that offers legitimate and respectable plays, is a religious motive; but a religious motive, be it ever so good and holy, cannot properly be made the basis for a civil law. Civil government should deal only with purely civil affairs.

Intolerance Not Heaven-Born

These religious measures are intolerant in that they seek to legalize and enforce a specific religious day commonly known as "the Lord's day" and considered "as holy time," while it penalizes those who observe another day and those who entertain no religious belief. The man who makes no profession of religion may be a better citizen than he who does.

During the hearings on these Sunday bills, their sponsors, representing various religious organizations, were most intolerant in their attitude toward their opponents. Remarks were

made by ministers of the gospel, so filled with hate and venom, so acrimonious and villifying, as to offend common decency. One speaker went so far that his indecent and un-Christian expression was ordered struck from the record as unfit to print. Why was Rev. Wayne B. Womer, the secretary of the Lord's Day Alliance for Michigan, imported from the district represented by Mr. McLeod, who is chairman of the committee conducting the hearings on these bills? Was it for the purpose of intimidation? Mr. Womer informed Mr. McLeod that all the Protestant churches, the Roman Catholic Church, and the Jewish people were behind him, backing these Sunday bills. Time and again the Congressmen were reminded that a solid church constituency was backing these bills, the inference being they would have to meet them back home. The religious bigot is always intolerant. Following one of the hearings, a Lord's Day Alliance representative became so violent that he doubled up his fist and shoved it repeatedly under the nose of a moving-picture man, calling him a liar and telling him to shut his mouth. A National Reformer and a minister approved this pugnacious and fiery attitude by saying, "Did not Christ make a whip of cords, and drive the money changers out of the temple?" Some one answered him, "Yes, Christ drove evil men out of the church, but He did not drive them into the church, as you attempt to do by this law."

Chairman McLeod asked the proponents of the Sunday bills if these laws would not work a hardship upon Seventh-day Adventists and others who observe another day than Sunday. The reformers replied in the affirmative, and justified the hardship by saying that the minority ought to submit to the majority. But the inalienable rights of the minority are just as sacred as the rights of the majority. The Constitutional guaranties of religious freedom are among the inalienable rights of all men, which Congress has no constitutional power to abridge. The early Christian church was in the minority, and was oppressed by a pagan majority; and now these religious legalists and reformers are adopting the intolerant spirit of paganism, asserting that the minority have no rights which the majority need respect. The three Hebrew children in Babylon, Daniel in the den of lions, Christ before Pilate, and all the Christian martyrs were in the minority, and were denied their God-given, inalienable rights by an intolerant majority. "We have a law," said they,

BISHOP WILLIAM T. MANNING, Protestant Episcopal Church: "This proposed campaign for stricter Sunday laws is one of those well-meant but misguided efforts which do harm instead of good to the cause they are intended to serve. It is impracticable, wrong in principle, and based on a narrow and imperfect conception of the Christian religion. It would do far more to drive religion out of the hearts of the people than to draw them toward it. We have no right to try to compel religious observance of Sunday by law."—Quoted in the Outlook, Dec. 8, 1920.

"whereby we are justified in condemning these men." That is the old plea of the tyrant. He sets up the dignity of the law above the majesty of the conscience. But the American Constitution says, No; the conscience, the inalienable right of man to life, liberty, and happiness, is greater than the intolerant will of the majority.

Congress Bound by the Constitution

It was asserted that Congress is not bound to observe the First Amendment to the Constitution in legislating for the District of Columbia; that it does not sit in the capacity of a Federal Congress, but as a board of aldermen. But can a board of aldermen violate the First Amendment to the Constitution? Can they make a law to abridge the freedom of the press and of speech? Can they deny the rights of petition? This experiment has been tried out, not only by boards of aldermen, but by State legislatures, and their acts have been declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. Every American is a citizen both of his State and of the United States, and no State legislature or board of aldermen has a right to pass a law that abridges or invades the rights of a citizen of the United States guaranteed to him by the Federal Constitution. Could a board of aldermen pass a law to legalize slavery? There is one State that has never ratified the Constitutional Amendment prohibiting slavery. Can that State legislature pass a law reinstating slavery and traffic in slaves? Would the United States Supreme Court say, We cannot interfere? Every sane man knows what would happen to such a law. The Congress of the United States is bound by the Constitution, whether it acts as a lawmaking body for all the people or as a board of aldermen for the District of Columbia.

Juggling With Statistics

The representatives of religious organizations who appeared before the Congressional committee demanding legal recognition and the enforcement of Sunday observance under the penal codes, repeatedly stated that the great majority favor this sort of reform legislation. They referred to this denomination and that denomination as standing solidly back of these bills. They cited the Catholic Church, Jewish rabbis, reform organizations, and labor unions as favoring these measures. One would have thought, after listening to their array of statistics, that

none but Seventh-day Adventists and nonprofessors of religion were opposed to this legislation.

But the hearings revealed the fact that the District Commissioners, the Advisory Board of Counselors for the District, the Chamber of Commerce, the Merchants and Manufacturers Association, nearly every citizens' association in the District, labor organizations, both District and national, the Board of Realtors, the amusement interests, representing some 50,000 baseball fans and 65,000 theater and movie patrons, the five daily newspapers of the city of Washington, and about eighty-five people out of every hundred that had been solicited from house to house with petitions, were opposed to Sunday legislation of any kind, because it is wrong in principle. The Lord's Day Alliance has always been afraid of the voice of the people on this issue. They know that Sunday laws have invariably been defeated when submitted to a vote of the people.

A few illustrations will suffice to show where public sentiment stands on the question of Sunday laws. In 1914 California submitted this question to the people, and the Sunday laws were voted down by a majority of 167,211. Oregon, with a much smaller population than California, made a similar test, and its people voted down the Sunday law by a majority of over 32,000. Forty cities and towns in Massachusetts submitted this question to the people on local option, and thirty-eight out of the forty voted against blue laws. Many isolated cities and towns in States where Sunday laws are dead letters on the statute books, have voted against such laws on the local option plan to the tune of 2 to 1, 3 to 1, 4 to 1, and as high as 14 to 1. When the Sunday law advocates tell legislators that the majority are in favor of such laws, they are juggling with statistics.

Recently the writer attended a series of mass meetings held by a "professional reformer" in different churches on Sunday in behalf of Sunday legislation. One church had a membership of over 600, but only twenty-four were present at this "mass meeting," and six of these were Seventh-day Adventists. The Adventists voted against the Sunday bills, and the other eighteen voted for them. But this preacher sent a petition to Congress, affirming that the entire church membership of over 600 favored Sunday legislation and the bills pending before Congress.

"It is not the lack of blue laws that makes empty churches. It is the lack of a vital appeal in the church itself. Some denominations that never concern themselves with politics or blue or other sumptuary laws, never complain of lack of attendance. Those churches which observe Saturday as the Sabbath, in spite of all the inconvenience incurred thereby, have uniformly large congregations. Blue laws will not increase church attendance. The remedy for empty pews lies within the church, and not without, and is a matter for the church to rectify, and not the state."
— Capital Journal, Salem, Oregon, Nov. 30, 1920.

This farce was repeated in eight churches, the writer being present, and the attendance and membership was in about the same ratio; yet each time a petition went to Congress, stating that the entire membership favored the Sunday measures then pending. If this is not juggling with statistics and misleading Congressmen, then pray tell us what it is! It is a case where an active, organized minority is outgeneraling through strategy an unorganized, inactive majority, and seeking to "put it over" on Congressmen. They may succeed in fooling some of the Congressmen all the time, and some of them a part of the time, but they cannot fool all the Congressmen all the time. Unless Protestantism stays out of politics and stops playing the political game, she is going to have a rude awakening one of these days, when she herself becomes the victim of the evil principle for which she is now contending. Political religion has always been a failure, and ever will be, because it is based on a wrong premise and a false conception of Christianity. The more political power a church gains, the faster will her spiritual life wane. Christianity must become corrupted before it can enter the political arena to further its ends.

Churches Follow a Corrupting Precedent

The churches today that are tarrying in Cæsar's antechamber, clamoring for legal sanction of their doctrines, are following the same mistaken course that led to a union of church and state at the beginning of the Dark Ages.

Neander, the great church historian, throws considerable light on this subject, showing how the early church became corrupt. He says:

"There had in fact arisen in the church, as we observed in the previous period, a false theological theory. . . . This theocratical theory was already the prevailing one in the time of Constantine; and . . . the bishops voluntarily made themselves dependent on him by their disputes, and by their determination to make use of the power of the state for the furtherance of their aims."—*Neander's "General History of the Christian Religion and Church," Torrey's Translation, Vol. II, p. 132.*

The church began its invasion of the field of politics by asking the civil government to close

up the shows and amusement places on holy days. At a convention held at Carthage in 401, the church resolved for the first time to petition the Roman emperor:

"That the public shows might be transferred from the Christian Sunday and from feast days to some other days of the week."—*Id., p. 300.*

The reason which the church hierarchy gave for making this demand upon the state was:

"The people collect more at the circus than at the church."—*Id., Note 5.*

Says Neander:

"Owing to the prevailing passion at that time, especially in the large cities, to run after the various public shows, it so happened that when these spectacles fell on the same days which had been consecrated by the church to some religious festival, they proved a great hindrance to the devotion of Christians, though chiefly, it must be allowed, to those whose Christianity was the least an affair of the life and of the heart."—*Id., p. 300.*

The trouble was that church members did not have enough Christianity to keep them away from the public shows when they should have been in church, and the church was too indolent to discipline its own members; and so the clergy shifted the question of church discipline to the state. This resulted in a union of church and state, with consequent persecution and the ultimate establishment of the Inquisition.

The church appealed to the secular power to destroy competition between the church and the shows on Sunday. The bishops did not get at once all they asked for, but they kept increasing their demands until the emperor finally, in 425, prohibited exhibitions on Sunday, "in order that the devotion of the faithful might be free from all disturbance," and that "every faculty of the mind should be occupied with the worship of God."—*Id., p. 301, Note 1.*

Neander adds:

"In this way the church received help from the state for the furtherance of her ends."—*Id., p. 301.*

This leaning upon the arm of the state for support led to a complete union of church and state, and the development of a spirit of intolerance and religious persecution of all dissenters

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL: "There is not a precept in the New Testament to compel by civil law any man who is not a Christian, to pay any regard to the Lord's day, any more than to any other day.

"Therefore to compel a man who is not a Christian to pay any regard to the Lord's day, more than to any other day, is without the authority of the Christian religion.

"The gospel commands no duty which can be performed without faith in God. 'Whatever is not of faith is sin.'

"But to compel men destitute of faith to observe any Christian institution, such as the Lord's day, is commanding a duty to be performed without faith in God.

"Therefore to command unbelievers, or natural men, to observe in any sense the Lord's day, is anti-evangelical, or contrary to the gospel."—"Memoirs," Vol. I, p. 528.

and nonconformists to such an intense degree that it was then, says Neander, "that a theory was proposed and founded, which . . . contained the germ of that whole system of spiritual despotism, of intolerance and persecution, which ended in the tribunals of the Inquisition."—*Id.*, p. 217.

This bit of church history ought to be an everlasting warning to modern churchmen and statesmen not to repeat the experiment. The ashes of the martyrs of truth and the blood of the champions of religious liberty, who wrested the present heritage of freedom from the religious-political bondage of the past, should forever deter our Congressmen from giving state aid to the churches that are clamoring for it in order to further ecclesiastical interests. The churches today are pursuing the same policy and are advocating the same laws as did the churches of the fourth and fifth centuries,—a course which then culminated in the most terrible religious despotism the world has ever witnessed.

The identical theories and religious measures are being advocated now by the religious legalists, as were advanced by the Puritan theocracy of New England, which led to the banishment of Roger Williams, the whipping of Baptists, and the hanging of Quakers. We stand with Roger Williams, and deny the right of the civil magistrate to enforce any of "the first table of the law, comprised in the first four of the ten commandments."

An Appeal to the Clergy

Let us not as ministers pervert the gospel of love, but let us preach it in the fulness of divine power, with meekness and grace, with brotherly love and charity. Christ made no alliance with the civil power; He asked no aid of Cæsar to promulgate His teachings. He was tolerant toward the sinner and the unbeliever. He said:

"If any man hear My words, and believe not, I judge [condemn] him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. . . . The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John 13: 47, 48.

If Christ refused to condemn unbelievers before the last great day, certainly His ambassadors should follow His example:

Paul says, "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God." Rom. 14: 22. No man is wise enough, good enough, or great enough to sit in judgment upon the motives of another man." In speaking of our duties to God and of

the observing of days, the apostle Paul says:

"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." "Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at naught thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." "Let us not therefore judge one another any more." "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Rom. 14: 5, 10, 13, 23.

To compel by law an individual to conform to the observance of a religious dogma in which he has no faith, is sin. Such a law can make only hypocrites instead of Christians. The only kind of religion acceptable to God is heart religion, and service that is absolutely voluntary.

Christ founded His kingdom upon the principle of love and voluntary service. His love was ultimately to triumph over the rule of force. Love is the fulfilling of His law. Love was to dominate the heart of man, and win the sinner back to God. At Calvary, Christ gave us an exhibition of the depths of His great love for sinners; and the preacher who substitutes the club of the policeman for the cross of Calvary as an appeal to sinners, has lost his vision and betrayed his trust. The church that tarries in Cæsar's antechamber seeking an endowment of civil power for the purpose of driving sinners into the kingdom, is not worthy to be called a church.

The gospel can be advanced only by gospel means and methods. Christianity can live and thrive only as it exemplifies the spirit and teachings of Christ. When the appeal of the preacher, radiating the love and mercy of Calvary, fails to draw sinners to the Saviour, then all has failed, and it is futile to appeal to the force of law and the authority of the civil magistrate. But the cross of Calvary will not fail. "I, if I be lifted up from the earth," said Christ, "will draw all men unto Me."

Let me appeal again to my fellow ministers of the gospel: Preach Christ and Him crucified, for the gospel is the power of God to save sinners. Lost humanity longs for more of the winning, wooing love and spirit of the Man of Galilee, the unchanging, unfailing Friend of publicans and sinners. Let us preachers give the people a little more Christ and a little less Pharisee. Let us tarry a little longer in the secret chamber of prayer, and spend less time in the antechamber of Cæsar. Let us pray more earnestly for power from above, that we may win souls for Christ, and build up His everlasting kingdom.

HENRY WARD BEECHER, in a sermon in 1862: "John Calvin, whose name is held up to such reproach, would, if he were alive today, be an advanced man in the community; he was a natural reformer; and in lecturing his students on the subject of the Sabbath, and telling them of its blessings and good influences, said to them, 'Keep the Lord's day unless men in authority command you to keep it; then break it as an evidence of your liberty.'"—Congressional Record, Dec. 21, 1925, p. 873.

JAMES MADISON: "Religion and government will both exist in greater purity the less they are mixed together."

Facing a Crisis

WE have reached a crisis in this country, involving the stability of both true Americanism and genuine Christianity.

If there is anything fundamental in Americanism, if that term really means anything to us, if it is more than a word with which to conjure and to deceive, it must have its foundation in the Declaration of Independence, a document in which the fathers of this nation, "appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude" of their intentions, set forth as a fundamental principle the doctrine that all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

But today this wholesome doctrine is challenged, and it is unblushingly asserted by many that as against the majority there is no such thing as an inalienable right; and consequently, by extension, might makes right.

Ours a Government, Not of Men, but of Law

If we mistake not, it was only a few years ago that some of the brightest minds of the nation, some of the leaders in safe and sane thinking along political lines, one of them being David Jayne Hill, LL. D., organized a society or association for the preservation of constitutional government, setting forth as an axiom that ours is "a government, not of men, but of law."

But what becomes of that fundamental principle if individuals have no rights, but only privileges, and if the majority have not only the power but the right to do as they will?

The only safe majority is the individual and the fundamental law. There is and can be no liberty where right rests upon the whim or the prejudices of the "majority," or in other words, of the mob, for it not infrequently happens that the mob is, or seems to be, the "majority." It was so in the French Revolution; it may be so today.

Facing a Serious Situation

That we stand face to face with a most serious situation, a situation that seems to threaten the very foundations of our Christian civilization,

there can be no reasonable question. Moral standards are being lowered; moral fiber is weakening; passion, not principle, is too often in the saddle.

To meet this situation, some of our best men, men who are honestly desirous of staying the onrushing tide of evil, seem ready to sweep away the safeguards of liberty erected by our forefathers, and to trust not only themselves but the destiny of their country to the fickle whim of the so-called "majority," unfettered and unrestrained by constitutional law!

But if this evil principle shall be adopted, if the sentiment prevails that individuals have no inalienable rights, but only granted privileges, and that those privileges may be abridged or wholly withdrawn at any time by the so-called majority, or even by an aggressive, militant, thoroughly organized minority, posing as the majority, what safety is there for any one? What security is there for any right, civil or religious?

The Situation Not Unique

The situation that confronts lawmakers now is not unique. There was a moral slump in the early centuries of the Christian era. The Jews had rejected Christ and His doctrines. Heathen Rome had put Him to death. In the face of this situation, the heralds of the cross went everywhere, declaring that "they be no gods which are made with hands."

The result was fierce persecution. Christians perished by scores and by hundreds in the Roman arena, slain either by the swords of the gladiators or by wild beasts fed largely upon human flesh.

Good Men Were Persecutors

Some of the best of the Roman emperors were the worst of persecutors, because they acted from a sense of duty. They saw no other way to preserve society. As they viewed it, to let the Christians alone to carry forward their propaganda in favor of Christ and against the national deities, would be to invite the destruction of the religion they had, without building up anything to take its place that would be

CHIEF JUSTICE CLARK, of the supreme court of North Carolina: "The first Sunday law, the edict of the emperor Constantine, was the product of that pagan conception developed by the Romans, which made religion a part of the state. . . . In the New Testament we shall look in vain for any requirement to observe Sunday. . . . The Old Testament commanded the observance of the Sabbath, . . . and it designated Saturday, not Sunday, as the day of rest. . . . As late as the year 409 two rescripts of the emperors Honorius and Theodosius indicate that Christians then still generally observed the Sabbath (Saturday, not Sunday). . . . What religion and morality permit or forbid to be done on Sunday is not within our province to decide."—North Carolina Reports, Vol. CXXXIV, pp. 508-515.

better, or promise greater stability to Rome and its institutions.

Marcus Aurelius was one of the good emperors, but he reasoned thus. Naturally, he was kind of heart, but the Roman state, Roman morality, and the Roman religion must be preserved at all hazards; hence persecution of Christians, even to the death, was an absolute necessity.

A Lesson From England

Paternalism in government, and especially religious paternalism, has done incalculable harm in this world, and has caused untold suffering. Nor is that all: it has utterly failed of its purpose. Look today at the countries that have church and state with governmental religious instruction, and ask if they are morally better than our own country. The answer must be that they are not.

Was England made morally better by the religious features introduced into government by Cromwell under the Commonwealth? The wild abandon of immorality that immediately followed the restoration of the Stuarts proves that it was not.

Nor was England made more moral by the Sunday law of Charles II, the progenitor of all the older Sunday laws in this country. The situation was not made better by that statute. Nor are moral conditions better in that country today than in our own land of free America.

With the introduction of Christianity, and the militant spirit in which its apostles went forth, not only to promulgate its tenets, but to testify against all false systems of worship, paganism and decadent Judaism began to break down.

This alarmed not only the priests, but also the civil rulers. Of the work of the Master Himself, the rulers of the Jews said: "If we let Him thus alone, all men will believe on Him: and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation."

Thus they easily persuaded themselves that the death of Jesus was essential to the preservation of both the Jewish church and the Jewish state.

The Same Today

It is the same today; certain measures are demanded as essential to the preservation of

the American state; but they can effect nothing. Real moral reformations are wrought, not by legislation, but by the preaching of the gospel of the Son of God. Witness the moral uplift that took place in England in the latter part of the seventeenth century, due, not to civil legislation, but to the teaching and writing of John Bunyan, hounded and imprisoned by the Established Church under religious laws, but strong in faith, giving glory to God.

The same was true in the early years of the eighteenth century. Religion was at low ebb; the church was honeycombed with gambling, sporting, intoxication, and immorality. An uplift did not come through civil legislation, but by the preaching of the Wesleys and those who joined them in exposing sin and in pointing sinners to the only Saviour of men, the Lord Jesus Christ. A real moral uplift can come in no other way today. "Not by might, nor by power, but by My Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

C. P. B.

First Congressional Answer to Sunday Legislation

The proper object of government is to protect all persons in the enjoyment of their religious as well as civil rights, and not to determine for any whether they shall esteem one day above another, or esteem all days alike holy. . . .

It is not the legitimate province of the legislature to determine what religion is true, or what false.

Our government is a civil, and not a religious institution. . . .

Among all the religious persecutions with which almost every page of modern history is stained, no victim ever suffered but for the violation of what government denominated the law of God. . . .

If the principle is once established that religion, or religious observances, shall be interwoven with our legislative acts, we must pursue it to its ultimatum.—"American State Papers," Class VII, p. 225.

CHARLES SPURGEON: "I am ashamed of some Christians because they have so much dependence on Parliament and the law of the land. Much good may Parliament ever do to true religion, except by mistake. As to getting the law of the land to touch our religion, we earnestly cry, 'Hands off! leave us alone!' Your Sunday bills and all other forms of act-of-Parliament religion seem to me to be all wrong. Give us a fair field and no favor, and our faith has no cause to fear. Christ wants no help from Caesar."

"Making it a misdemeanor to keep open and conduct a barber shop or to work as a barber on Sundays and other holidays is an undue restraint of personal liberty, and is special legislation, based upon an arbitrary classification, and not a proper exercise of the police power, and is unconstitutional and void."—Decision of Supreme Court of California, April 17, 1896.

Our Position

WE believe in government as an institution divinely ordained for the good of man. We believe that civil government was ordained to regulate the affairs of men only as between man and man, and not in any case as between man and God. There is a government specifically ordained to govern in the spiritual realm, and that is the government of God.

The two realms—the civil and the spiritual—are as separate in legitimate administration as they are distinct in nature. When the civil ruler obtrudes himself into the realm of the spiritual, and assumes to dictate the religious faith and practice of men, he has usurped the prerogatives of divinity, and taken over a portion of the divine government. In taking such a course, civil government has set itself against God and trampled upon His rights. In ancient Israel the mingling of the sacred and the profane was punished with a severity that should indicate to all men how the God of Israel regards such conduct. (See Lev. 10:1-11; Ex. 30:9.)

Not only has civil government no authority to dictate the religious conduct of men, but it has no authority to decide religious controversies and dictate the faith of the people. The Word of God, to the Christian, must be the rule in matters of faith, and religious controversies not settled therein cannot be settled by other means. For civil government to attempt to settle a religious controversy, is as unreasonable as for a society of mathematicians to attempt to prepare a grammar of the language spoken on Mars. The Word of God being man's only true rule of faith and practice, there is no other basis for the settlement of religious questions. For civil government or any other institution to attempt to settle a religious controversy by civil enactment, is to declare the Bible an insufficient guide in such things, thus casting discredit upon its Author. Civil government has, therefore, no dominion in such matters.

We believe in the primacy of conscience in matters religious; that is, in the supremacy of each man's conscience over his own religious

conduct. When one man allows his conscience to be dominated by another, he loses his spiritual identity. There are then no longer two consciences for the two men, but one only—one man acting for two, and responsible for the course of two. When one man has thus subjugated another, he has robbed God of His glory, and robbed his brother of his eternal birthright. God designed that each man should stand for himself. We cannot give up the primacy of our own conscience over our own religious faith and practice, without sin.

We hold to the right of every man to believe what to him seems believable and right, to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, without the interference of any power from without. We believe this because the operation of the opposite principle has made hypocrites of millions and martyrs of other millions. The right to act in harmony with the dictates of conscience is the dearest right vouchsafed to man. The man who gives up that right has permitted himself to be robbed of his manhood. Nor does robbery cease there. He who worships God under the direction of another's conscience, does not worship Him at all. Neither can he expect the reward of the faithful child of God. In surrendering his conscience, he surrenders his right to the eternal inheritance.

We believe it to be un-Christian to ask that the creed of any religion, or any portion of any religion, be codified and forced upon the people as their rule of faith and practice. Paul asks, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." Rom. 14:4. He who attempts to dominate the conscience of another, attempts to put himself in the place of lord to that other. He who would codify and enforce his creed upon men, attempts to assume the position of lordship over men purchased by the blood of Christ, thus robbing Christ of His dearly purchased possession.

Therefore we say with U. S. Grant, "Keep church and state forever separate." A union of the two is out of harmony with the purpose of Jesus Christ, and is destructive of the best interests of both institutions.

CHIEF JUSTICE TERRY, of the supreme court of California, in declaring enforced Sunday observance unconstitutional: "The enforced observance of a day held sacred by one of the sects, is a discrimination in favor of that sect, and a violation of the freedom of others. . . . Considered as a municipal regulation, the legislature has no right to forbid or enjoin the lawful pursuit of a lawful occupation on one day of the week, any more than it can forbid it altogether."—9 California, 502.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: "When religion is good, it will take care of itself; when it is not able to take care of itself, and God does not see fit to take care of it, so that it has to appeal to the civil power for support, it is evidence to my mind that its cause is a bad one."—Letter to Dr. Price.

Important Notice

TO ALL LOVERS OF LIBERTY



Please read carefully the "Petition to Congress" on the opposite page, and the compulsory Sunday observance bills on the last page. Fill in the blank spaces, start the list with your own name, and secure as many other signatures opposing this drastic religious legislation as possible.

If there are not enough lines, paste extra sheets of paper at the bottom, after cutting the petition out of the magazine.

Send the petition with signatures to your Representative from your district serving in Congress, in care of House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

This Copy is an Extra of Liberty



LIBERTY is a 32-page, illustrated quarterly publication issued in the interests of civil and religious liberty. We believe that the state and the church each has its place in the life of the individual and the life of the nation, but that these should be separate and distinct. Therefore we are unalterably opposed to any and all legislation which would tend toward a union of these two.

We invite the reader to assist us in the work of keeping these principles, which are fundamental in our nation, before the public, to the extent at least of favoring us with a subscription to **LIBERTY**.

Subscription price, one year, 35 cents; three years, \$1.

USE THIS BLANK

Inclosed find _____ (35 cents or \$1), for which send **LIBERTY**
(one year, or three years)

To _____

Address, **LIBERTY**, TAKOMA PARK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Against Compulsory Sunday Observance

Believing —

- We, the undersigned, adult residents of**

[illegible]

Copies of Sunday Bills Now Before Congress

H. R. 10311

To secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person, firm, corporation, or any of their agents, directors, or officers to employ any person to labor or pursue any trade or secular business on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, works of necessity and charity always excepted. It shall furthermore be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person under employment or working for hire to engage in labor under such contract of employment or hire on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, except in works of necessity and charity.

In works of necessity and charity is included whatever is needful during the day for the good order, health, or comfort of the community, provided the right to weekly rest and worship is not thereby denied. The labor herein forbidden on Sunday is hired, employed, or public work, not such personal work as does not interrupt or disturb the repose and religious liberty of the community. The following labor and business shall be legal on Sunday:

(a) In drug stores for the sale of medicines, surgical articles, and supplies for the sick, foods, beverages, and cigars, but not for articles of merchandise forbidden on Sunday for other stores and merchants.

(b) In hotels, restaurants, and cafes, and in the preparation and sale of meals.

(c) For the sale of motor oil, gasoline, and accessories necessary to keep in operation cars in actual use on such Sunday, together with labor incident to such repairs.

(d) In connection with public lighting, water, and heating plants.

(e) For the operation of boats, railroad trains, street cars, buses, sight-seeing cars, taxicabs, elevators, and privately owned means of conveyance.

(f) For telephone and radio service.

(g) In dairies and in connection with preparation and delivery of milk and cream.

(h) In connection with watching, caretaking, or safeguarding premises and property, and in the maintenance of police and fire protection.

(i) In connection with the preparation and sale of daily newspapers.

Sec. 2. That it shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia to keep open or use any dancing place, theater (whether for motion pictures, plays spoken or silent, opera, vaudeville, or entertainment), bowling alley, or any place of public assembly at which an admission fee is directly or indirectly received, or to engage in commercialized sports or amusements on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday.

Sec. 3. It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person, firm, corporation, or any of their agents, directors, or officers to require or permit any employee or employees engaged in works of necessity and charity, excepting household or hotel service, to work on the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, unless within the next six succeeding days during a period of twenty-four consecutive hours such employer shall neither require nor permit such employee or employees to work in his or its employ.

Sec. 4. It shall be a sufficient defense to a prosecution for work or labor on the first day of the week that the defendant uniformly keeps another day of the week as holy time and does not labor on that day, and that the labor complained of was done in such manner as not to interrupt or disturb other persons in observing the first day of the week.

Sec. 5. Any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this Act shall, on conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not less than \$5 nor more than \$50 for the first offense, and for each subsequent offense by a fine of not less than \$25 nor more than \$500 and by imprisonment in the jail of the District of Columbia for a period of not more than six months.

Sec. 6. All prosecutions for the violation of this Act shall be in the police court of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 7. This Act shall become effective on the sixtieth day after its enactment.

H. R. 7170

To secure Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sunday being recognized by the Constitution of the United States as the day of rest of the President, and implicit of the whole people, and being by general consent set apart for rest and religious uses as a civil institution older than any established government, this Act prohibits the doing on that day of certain acts hereinafter specified which are serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community, in order to protect the right of every person to one day of rest in every seven and in order to preserve the day free from unnecessary labor and business, for all who wish the opportunity publicly to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience.

Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful in the District of Columbia for any person to labor, etc.

[The rest of the text of this bill is substantially the same as H. R. 10311, which has a few additional exemptions.]

H. R. 7822

To provide for the closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia on Sunday.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person to open or allow to be opened or carry on business in any barber shop or place where the business of shaving, hair cutting, shampooing, or the like shall be conducted on Sunday in the District of Columbia:

Sec. 2. Any person or persons who shall violate the provisions of this Act upon conviction shall pay a fine of not exceeding \$20 or, in default thereof, be imprisoned not exceeding sixty days, and for a second offense shall be imprisoned not exceeding sixty days.

H. R. 10123

To prohibit public dancing, theaters, and other secular and commercialized sports and amusements on Sunday in the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That from and after the passage of this Act it shall be unlawful for any person, firm, or corporation to keep open any dance hall, theater, or other places where secular and commercialized sports and amusements are carried on or staged, for which admissions are charged, in the District of Columbia, on Sunday.

Any one violating this Act upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$10 nor more than \$100 for the first offense, and for each subsequent offense by a fine of not less than \$100 nor more than \$500 and by imprisonment in the District of Columbia jail not to exceed six months.

The police court of the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction in all prosecutions hereunder.

